

To the Editor,

In the July *Journal*, W. E. Cox discussed his work with the high-scoring Swedish-American psychic, Olof Jonsson. In the article he also mentioned that we did several experiments with Jonsson in which we measured his brain electrical activity during psi tasks run under well-controlled laboratory conditions.

It was somewhat surprising to us that Cox did not mention our study with Jonsson using the ESPerciser (Psychophysical Research Laboratories, 1985), a computerized guessing task which is not subject to any of the sources of fraud or sensory leakage possible in card tests such as Cox conducted (Don, McDonough & Warren, 1992). As far as we have been able to determine, this study is unique in that it tests a high-scoring but controversial psychic from a previous generation, using computer-controlled contemporary methodology. In this task, Jonsson successfully guessed 88 targets in 288 four-choice trials ($p = 0.019$, one-tailed exact binomial).

While our published research on Jonsson has dealt only with formal laboratory experiments, we also observed him in less formal contexts, sometimes producing extraordinary results, similar to Cox's reports. During the fall of 1994, the first author paid a visit to Jonsson, and found him in very poor health and in need of transportation to his physician's office.

I helped him into the examining room and stayed with him. The nurse came in, did some preliminary inspection of his leg surgery, and left us alone to wait for the physician. Jonsson was at this point seated on the side of the examining table wearing only his undershorts. After a few minutes, he asked me if I had any Zener cards with me because "the condition is good for a test".

I had two of my own decks in my pocket, in the event that, despite poor health, Jonsson might offer to be informally tested if 'the condition is good'. I sat across the room from him, approximately twelve feet away, shuffled a deck ten times then cut it, and held it between the palms of my hands. He called the cards quickly, and after each call I peeled off the top card and turned it over so we both could see it, and placed it on a pile to my right if it was a hit, and to my left if it was a miss. The uncalled cards were not visible to him. There were 16 cards in the correct pile and 9 in the incorrect ($p = 2.06 \times 10^{-6}$, one-tailed exact binomial).

I must repeat that this is not the kind of work we did with Jonsson in our laboratory. But these informal demonstrations were of interest to us, both because of the high scores he sometimes achieved and also because they provided an opportunity to ask questions about what he experiences when 'the condition is good'.

We have obtained a rather large amount of descriptive information this way, which we will report at a later date. On this occasion, Jonsson said that most of the symbols were very clear to him and "floated into my mind". After I questioned him further, he elaborated that the symbol images were experienced as "hanging in space" across the room from him, approximately two to three meters in width and height.

We have obtained the same description from another subject we worked with. The creation of such 'veridical hallucinations' gives us some insight into how the brain must be processing this information—which we will also report on at a later date.

Therefore, we would like to see more subjects, as controversial as they often are, can be tested. Unlike a generation ago, they can be tested on free-response tasks such as Ganzfeld and remote viewing, and even 'user-friendly' PK tasks, which are secure and much less daunting than card guessing. But we would urge investigators to obtain experiential information also. Although these details may be spotty or idiosyncratic, they may be helpful in unfolding the nature of psi.

Kairos Foundation and
University of Illinois at Chicago
1187 Wilmette Avenue, Apt. 174
Wilmette, IL 60091, U.S.A.

NORMAN S. DON
BRUCE E. McDONOUGH
CHARLES A. WARREN

REFERENCES

- Don, N. S., McDonough, B. E. and Warren, C. A. (1992) Psi testing of a controversial psychic under controlled conditions. *JP* 56, 87-96.
Psychophysical Research Laboratories (1985) *Psilab II User's Manual*. Princeton, NJ: Psychophysical Research Laboratories.

To the Editor,

Mary Rose Barrington (July issue, p.45), in her zeal to rescue William Crookes and D. D. Home from the exposure I gave them in my book, *The Sorcerer of Kings*, has committed far more manipulation of the 'facts' than she even accuses me of doing. She fails utterly to examine one by one the possibilities raised by my 'smoking gun' exposure of the Varley test of Annie Eva Fay. If she had done so, she would have seen that the conscious participation in fraud by Crookes is the only possibility left other than that Serjeant Cox made up the whole incident as he claims to have seen it. As I explain, Mrs Fay would have needed access to Crookes's equipment (in his house), plus a team of electrical experts, in order to have faked the results herself.

That Crookes was a convinced spiritualist from before the time he began his investigations is not my opinion, but a quotation from Crookes's own diary. His biographer, E. E. Fournier d'Albe, who had access to many of Crookes's papers on spiritualism before they were destroyed, agrees with my assessment. The discovery of Home with a vial of oil of phosphorus is only one of six accusations of fraud that have been made against Home (as I point out). Casting some doubt on the origins of one of the charges, as Barrington tries to do, still leaves the other five charges intact.

The accordion (concertina) playing untouched in the dark using a concealed harmonica in Home's mouth is perfectly consistent with the tones capable of being produced by the two instruments, and I have been assured by an eminent musicologist that the average person could not tell the difference. It is also quite interesting to me that Barrington completely ignores my explanation of how Home probably did his two famous types of levitation. Is Barrington willing to accept those explanations as valid, while criticizing the explanations of the much more trivial Home phenomena that I have given?

It is a shame that no matter how carefully something is examined and documented, those who refuse to admit that they were wrong will always come up with some excuse or another for not changing their minds about the matter in the light of the new evidence.

P.O. Box 972
Amherst, NY 14226, U.S.A.

GORDON STEIN

Mary Rose Barrington replies:

It is hardly surprising that Dr Stein finds his own arguments more convincing than I found them (and *mutatis mutandis*).

Fraud by Crookes is by no means the only interpretation of Cox's sighting. Other possibilities include introduction into the circuit of a resistor by Mrs Fay while Crookes was adjusting the controls to a value he assumed to represent herself locked into the circuit. (The technical skill of conjurors never ceases to amaze.) If all these scientists believed that a plausible value could be shown only by Mrs Fay holding the terminals, this argues misplaced trust in the competence of science and the incompetence of woman. Another possibility is that the figure seen by Cox was something other than Mrs Fay, even something paranormal.

On 1st August 1874, Crookes wrote: "... During this whole time I have most earnestly desired to get the one proof you seek—the proof that the dead can return and communicate. I have never once had satisfactory proof that this is the case ..." (*Light*, 1900; Medhurst, Goldney & Barrington, 1972, p.237). These are not the words of a fanatical crusader ready to lie and cheat to persuade others to believe what he himself, however reluctantly, doubts.

In a few pages one cannot deal with a book point by point, but I am pleased to add (a) that I did not find the other five accusations any more convincing than the one I picked out, and (b) that Stein's levitation theory does not fit the facts *as reported*—for example, the sitting on 21st April 1872 when Home remained suspended horizontally in the air after his chair was removed (*Proc SPR*, 1889; Medhurst, Goldney & Barrington, 1972, p.210).

20 Denbigh Gardens
Richmond, Surrey TW10 6EN

REFERENCES

- Light* (1900) (12th May).
Medhurst, R. G., Goldney, K. M. and Barrington, M. R. (1972) *Crookes and the Spirit World*. London: Souvenir Press.
Proc SPR (1889) (15th December), 126.

To the Editor,

F. Somerville Roberts (July issue, p.61) criticizes attempts at physiological theories to 'explain' near-death experiences (NDEs). He considers that a life-review, which is a feature of such experiences, is not "a matter of memory recall; it is a case of actually experiencing again the original event, but without sensory perception".

The letter provides further evidence that a physicalistic paradigm is unable to accommodate data from NDEs or out-of-body experience (taking a physicalistic paradigm to be one that only admits phenomena and experience referable to a single spatial frame and to one irreversible progression of time). But Roberts' characterization of life-review as "a case of actually experiencing again the original event" needs some comment if it is not to become entangled in the paradigm. Clarification is particularly important, since Roberts' remarks on life-review during NDE touch on awareness out of physical time. In encompassing a more comprehensive understanding of time, such matters are likely to be crucially involved in a shift from the prevailing physicalistic paradigm.

Conceptually, awareness out of physical time is not problematic, unless thinking is constrained by the physicalistic paradigm. An increasing number of writers in various fields of science and mathematics have indeed argued that conceptual analysis is not possible without transcendence of the onward urge of physical time (Poynton, 1985). Whiteman (1967; 1993) in particular has given attention to the transcendence of physical time, and the skills required for achieving "time-stopped awareness". The occurrence of this awareness in music has been especially discussed by him; the ability to hold a melodic phrase "in an act of unified comprehension" as an intelligible whole, "out of time", is essential for balanced musical composition and highly skilled performance. Time-durations become "like features on a spatial map which can be explored backwards and forwards" (Whiteman, 1967).

The experience of time-durations as features on a spatial map has similarities with the life-review experience noted by Roberts in the case of NDEs; events may appear as if on a map, as "a developing *pattern* rather than a *stream*" (Whiteman, 1967). Such a map cannot be held to be located in physical space-time, as perceived by means of physical sensory perception. Scanning a map or structure of time-ordered potentiality may be confused with physical memory recall, if it is not clearly recognized that the level of manifestation is "different from that of physical awareness and logically prior to it" (Whiteman, 1967). As with out-of-body experience (OBE), confusion between manifestation at physical and nonphysical levels is apt to occur with inexperienced observers (Poynton, 1994). Roberts is no doubt correct to insist that NDE life-review experience is "in no way a matter of memory recall"; but some caution is needed regarding his assertion that the experience is "experiencing again the original event", if it is implied that the manifestation of both events is strictly physical. Physical actualization is fleeting and the actualities are irretrievable in physical time. A life-review manifestation is of necessity a *nonphysical* actualization, without the involvement of (physical) sensory perception, as stated by Roberts. As such it can, in principle, involve time-ordered potentiality structures repeatedly. It may be remarked that life-review experience is in essence no different from precognitive experience, in which physical time again

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor,

With regard to Dr Vernon Harrison's very interesting article (*Proc SPR* 58, Part 218), I must confess that I find it very difficult to believe that Sir Stafford Cripps, who died in April 1952, should be suffering from the effects of "old age, illness or a stroke" (p.35) so many years after his death. What sort of after-life would this imply?

Secondly, I find it even more difficult to believe that the eminent philosopher Bertrand Russell produced the farrago of nonsense that appears against his name (Plate 31). If this really is the case, then one can only conclude that some at least undergo a serious deterioration of their mental powers after death; and again I ask—what sort of after-life would this imply?

62E Charwood Street, London SW1V 2DP

PHILIP BRAND

Vernon Harrison replies:

We do not have to believe that Sir Stafford Cripps is still suffering from old age or ill health. I have already considered this problem in the paragraph beginning at the bottom line of p.38 of my paper ("if Myers and Cripps do survive...").

Certainly the text purporting to come from Bertrand Russell is nonsense—but it is *good* nonsense. It reads to me like a skit—something that one of Russell's more irreverent students might have written as a lampoon for the college magazine. How Matthew picked it up and from whom, I do not know. I do not think that Bertrand Russell wrote it. The signature is not Russell's although it is not wholly unlike it. On the other hand I find no evidence to suggest that either Matthew or Robert Webbe was directly responsible for it.

The question 'What survives?' is important and I discussed the problem briefly in Sections 12 and 13 of my paper. I believe that most (but not all) of the communications we receive through mediums come from 'Kâma-Mânasîc shells' in various stages of disintegration. They are the product, not of a growing, developing human being, but of the decaying remains of the discarded earth personality—the Mask. On this assumption most of the features of mediumistic communication can be explained.

However, not all communications coming ostensibly from the dead are of this type. I am fascinated by the writings of 'Patience Worth' (the communicator in Mrs Curran's automatic scripts, see p.60 of my paper). Chapter 25 of her novel *Hope Trueblood* is a literary gem. Her use of dialect is masterly: she can write passages that could come straight from the low-life characters of Shakespeare. Her poetry has both dignity and beauty, making natural use of rare archaisms and nonce-words that might well have been familiar to her around 1620 but have long since passed out of use and even out of the dictionaries. Patience Worth seems to me to be a living, perceptive and intelligent human being, lacking only a physical body.

Sole Farm House, Church Road, Great Bookham, Leatherhead KT23 3PQ

To the Editor,

Gordon Stein's defence (Stein, 1993) of his biography of D. D. Home (Stein, 1993) might be more convincing if he did not make such extravagant claims for this work. Thus he writes: "... I have tried to examine *everything* that in any way dealt with Home or Cook" (p.24).

But there are many such items that he does not seem to have consulted, since they do not appear either in the text or in the appended bibliography of his book. Books which bear upon Home's career which he does not appear to have consulted include works by Spicer (1853), Wilkinson (1855), Rymer (1857), Chevalier (1867), Anon (1868), Alexander (1871), Cox (1872), Lang (1904), McCabe (1920), Doyle (1926), Fodor (1934), Balchin (1950), Braude (1986) and Rogo (1986), amongst others. References to Home in the periodical literature which seem to have escaped Stein's researches are too numerous to list here, but two such omissions deserve special mention. First, in spite of Stein's frequent acknowledgement of the late Dr Dingwall's contributions to the study of Home and his phenomena, he omits all mention of an important paper (Dingwall, 1953) in this area. Second, Stein has failed to discuss an article which appeared under the *nom-de-plume* of 'Katerfelto' in 1860. Now Stein explains (1993, p.83) Home's 'self-playing' accordion by suggesting that Home produced the sound from a miniature (one-octave) harmonica concealed in his mouth. He records that this explanation was suggested when James Randi told him that William Lindsay Gresham had discovered such a miniature mouth-organ amongst some of Home's effects which had found their way to the SPR. (A similar account is given in a book by Martin Gardner (1988), where Gresham is said to have found several miniature mouth-organs). Gresham wrote an article, "King of the Spook Workers" about Home, which first appeared in *Argosy* in 1957, was reprinted in *Reader's Digest*, and then included in an anthology from this publisher in 1969. There is no mention of the miniature mouth-organ story in this article. Now the curious feature of this story is that 'Katerfelto' advanced exactly the same explanation of Home's accordion phenomenon in 1860; and Home could scarcely have been unaware of this. It therefore seems rather improbable that Home should have left such an incriminating object to find its way to the SPR, where no record of it now exists.

In view of Stein's reliance upon the writings of the late Trevor Hall, in his discussion of Florence Cook, it is unfortunate that he fails to consider any of the criticisms of Hall's work from authors such as Barnard (1963), Thouless (1963a; 1963b), Medhurst and Goldney (1964), Coleman (1974), etc. Stein's claim to provide a bibliography for future scholars (p.129) may be judged by the facts that his bibliography contains about the same number of entries as that of Jean Burton (1948) and about a third fewer than that appended to Dingwall's (1947) essay on Home; and since a third of Stein's references post-date 1948, these are necessarily absent from the works of the other two authors.

Stein's claims to scholarship are not enhanced by his criticisms of other writers. Thus he takes Lynn Picknett to task (p.24) for referring to Maurice Davies as 'Charles Davies': in fact, as anyone familiar with his works must be aware, his full name was Charles Maurice Davies. He criticizes Elizabeth

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor,

With regard to M. H. Coleman's letter in the July 1995 *Journal*, referring to me:—

1 My book *The Sorcerer of Kings* was not a biography of D.D. Home, as Coleman states, but rather an investigation of Crookes's interaction with Home and Florence Cook. This is made clear from the Table of Contents, subtitle, etc. The importance of this distinction is that I am under no obligation to supply *all* the details of Home's life, as I would in a biography.

2 The fact that something is *not* listed in my bibliography does not mean that I was unaware of it or did not consult it. In fact, I *did* consult almost all of the items Coleman lists. Why did I not include them in my bibliography, then? As I state on p.129 of the book, I list "... many [not all] of the difficult-to-identify books and articles on this subject to make it easier for future scholars to locate them." There is no claim to exhaustiveness.

3 I *did* miss the 'Katerfelto' reference, but I find Coleman's reasoning about not leaving his "mouth-organs" (harmonicas)—if he had any—to the SPR to be specious. It assumes that Home knew *in advance of his death* that the SPR was getting his possessions. If his widow or estate gave them without his knowledge, it could easily explain how the harmonicas reached the SPR. Also, anyone who packed up the items, but did not know of the supposed role of the harmonicas, could easily have included them without hesitation.

4 I am perfectly aware of the fact that Maurice Davies' real first name was Charles. My point was that he never used the Charles, and that to call him 'Charles' is to reveal that one knows nothing about him or his writings.

5 The 'Perkins' was a typo for 'Jenkins', and I have been aware of it for a long time. I somehow started referring to Miss Jenkins as Perkins, and subsequently this subconsciously got into the book and remained uncaught. So what?

6 I notice no comments about the facts I raise about Home, Cook or Crookes, other than the harmonica. Such comments would have much more weight in dealing with my conclusions of Crookes's conscious complicity in fraud.

P.O. Box 972
Amherst, NY 14226, U.S.A.

GORDON STEIN

M. H. Coleman replies:

I agree that, in spite of the title, Gordon Stein's book is not strictly a biography: I presume that the publishers judged that a more accurate title, in Theodore Besterman's phrase, 'would not be very vendipotent'.

I am not so naïve as to suppose that omission of a book from a bibliography implies that the author has not read it, or that its inclusion means that he has. But there is little evidence in Stein's text that he had consulted the titles that I listed. If Stein is so concerned for future scholars in this area, I suggest that

he should have included these titles in his bibliography, since many are as 'difficult-to-identify' as those he did include. I note he does not offer any explanation for the absence of any discussion of Dingwall's 1953 paper on Home in his book.

I find Stein's remarks about Davies's first name unconvincing, since he offers no evidence in support. I suspect that here he may be following the writings of the late Trevor Hall, without checking the material for himself. In fact, of the dozen or so titles of Davies's publications listed in the British Museum Library Catalogue, three-quarters appear under his full name of 'Charles Maurice Davies', and none appears under 'Maurice Davies'. I think most readers would consider that Stein's use of an incorrect surname for Elizabeth Jenkins is more reprehensible than the supposed fault for which he criticizes Lynn Picknett of using Davies's (correct) first name.

I have already commented on William Crookes's investigation of Florence Cook, a fact of which Stein must be aware, since he has "tried to examine *everything* that in any way dealt with ... Cook". I am not aware that he has unearthed anything novel in respect of D. D. Home's mediumship which requires comment. But there are a number of points to be made in reference to Stein's version of the miniature mouth organ story. I was not suggesting that Home bequeathed such an item to the SPR; the phrase "finding its way to the SPR" indicating that I regarded its arrival there as fortuitous. My argument was that if Home employed such an instrument to provide the music for his 'self-playing' accordion, he would scarcely leave it lying about, to be discovered after his death, and then to be presented to the SPR. D. D. Home was not a fool, and he must have been aware of the risk of exposure if he were found in possession of this device, especially after its use was suggested to explain the accordion phenomenon by 'Katerfelto', in a widely-circulated journal. Since Home abandoned physical mediumship after his second marriage, the sequence of events which Stein envisages would require Home to retain this incriminating device, for which he had no further use, for something like fourteen years. Since it was during this period that he published his book (Home, 1877) exposing mediumistic trickery, he would surely wish to avoid any risk of exposure himself, which retaining a miniature mouth organ amongst his possessions would engender.

Both the story of the finding of the miniature mouth organ and of its transmission seem lacking in "corroborative detail, intended to give artistic verisimilitude to an otherwise bald and unconvincing narrative". Of the three published accounts, neither Gardner (1988) nor Randi (1995) say where or by whom "several miniature mouth organs" were discovered amongst Home's effects; Stein (1993) states that Randi told him in 1990 that Gresham had discovered "a small harmonica among Home's effects held at the Society for Psychical Research in London"; but again no date is given, so we do not know where (geographically) this is supposed to have taken place. Both Gardner and Stein credit Randi as the source of the story, but none of these three specifies where or from whom, and in what terms, the story was first received. If Gresham was the source, and since he made no reference to the story in his 1957 article on Home in *Argosy*, this would suggest that the discovery was made after 1957. But this then raises serious doubts about the story's credibility.

Professor West, who was appointed Research Officer in 1946, organized a museum to exhibit items from the Society's collection, and he tells me that there was no such miniature mouth organ amongst these.

This is perhaps a suitable opportunity to challenge the belief that an accordion in the Society's possession actually belonged to D. D. Home. There seems to be no published evidence that Home ever owned an accordion. In many of the séances at which an accordion played, apparently without human aid, it is explicitly stated that the accordion belonged to one of the sitters (Adare, 1869; Alexander, 1871; Crookes, 1874; Home, Mme, 1888; Metternich, 1921; Rymer, 1857). Indeed, Mme Home states (1890):—

And not only were these accordions invariably the property of one or other of the investigators present, and never that of Home, but the remaining sitters could always verify, by inspection of the accordion, the fact that it was in all respects an ordinary instrument.

Hence I think that the Society's accordion, whilst it may well have been used at one of Home's séances, was not actually his property: after all, even the most gullible of sitters might have become suspicious if the medium always insisted on using his own accordion. The Society's acquisition of both documents and objects associated with Home is recorded in this *Journal* (Vol. 24, pp. 40 & 74). These were given by a nephew of A. N. Aksakoff, who was a relative of Home's second wife. There is no musical instrument—accordion or miniature mouth organ—included in this gift.

3 *The Ridgeway*
Putnoe, Bedford MK41 8ET

REFERENCES

- Adare, Viscount (1869) *Experiences in Spiritualism* . . . , 2. London.
Alexander, P. P. (1871) *Spiritualism: A Narrative* . . . Edinburgh: Nimmo.
Crookes, W. (1874) *Researches in . . . Spiritualism*, 9. London: Burns.
Gardner, M. (1988) *The New Age* . . . , 177. Buffalo: Prometheus.
Home, D. D. (1877) *Lights and Shadows of Spiritualism*. London: Virtue.
Home, Mme (1888) *D. D. Home his Life* . . . , 186. London: Trubner.
Home, Mme (1890) *The Gift of D. D. Home*, 74. London: Kegan Paul.
Metternich, Prin. P. (1921) *The Days that Are No More*, 186. London: Nash & Grayson.
Randi, J. (1995) *The Supernatural A-Z*, 159. London: Headline.
Rymer, J. S. (1857) *Spirit Manifestations*, 10. London: William White.
Stein, G. (1993) *The Sorcerer of Kings*, 83. Buffalo: Prometheus.

NOTES FOR AUTHORS

1 **Manuscripts** Authors are responsible for the opinions expressed. Papers are accepted on the understanding that they have not been published before and are not concurrently under offer elsewhere. They must be in English.

2 **Length of Manuscripts** Papers should not normally exceed 5,000 words. The title page should bear the title of the paper and the name(s) of the author(s), followed by a summary of the paper in about ten lines. Unless it is very short, the paper should be organized into sections. Authors are responsible for the preparation of any artwork and photographs, which should be of quality suitable for reproduction. The manuscript must be typed double-spaced with wide margins.

3 **References** For the sake of brevity use the following abbreviations:—

Journal of the Society for Psychical Research—JSPR
Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research—JASPR
Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research—ProcSPR
Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research—ProcASPR
Journal of Parapsychology—JP
European Journal of Parapsychology—EJP
International Journal of Parapsychology—IJP
Research in Parapsychology—RIP

All references should appear at the end of the paper in alphabetical order by author. Books should be cited thus: Hardy, A., Harvie, R., and Koestler, A. (1973) *The Challenge of Chance*. London: Hutchinson. Papers should be cited thus: Palmer, J. (1974) A case of RSPK involving a ten-year-old boy: the Powhatan poltergeist. *JASPR* 68 (1), 1-33. All references should be keyed into the text as follows: "as discussed by Hardy,

Harvie & Koestler (1973, Chap. 2)" or "as described by Palmer (1974)".

4 **Footnotes** These should be indicated by superscript numerals at the appropriate places (numbering consecutively). The notes should then be written out in full as an appendix to the paper under the heading, 'Footnotes'.

5 **Submission** Authors should submit two copies of their papers to the Editor at the Society for Psychical Research. Rejected manuscripts will be returned only if the postage is covered by stamps or international postal reply coupons.

6 **Publication** If the paper is accepted authors will receive photocopies of the typeset pages for checking and correction of any printer's errors. On publication four copies of the issue will be sent by the Society (joint authors of papers will each receive four copies).

COPYRIGHT

1 **Permissions** Authors are responsible for securing written permission to reproduce any published or unpublished material for which copyright is currently held. It is not normally necessary to secure permission to publish short quotations from published works.

2 **Transfer** It is hoped that authors will assign the copyright of their work to the Society for Psychical Research.

3 **Copyright Clearance (U.S.A.)** This is covered under the U.S. Federal Copyright Act (1976) by the code printed below. Copies of material in the issue may be made for personal or internal use of those clients who are registered with the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (21 Congress Street, Salem, Mass. 01970, U.S.A.).

© Society for Psychical Research 1996
ISSN 0037-1475

talked and the evening went on, it became perfectly clear to me that he was the phoniest 'psychic' I had ever met! I was looking for genuine psychological and spiritual growth and didn't want to waste my precious time under this charlatan's direction! Yet I had enormous respect for Dr Naranjo, so decided to go ahead with the arduous process.

That first evening was my only contact with Bob Hoffman until a final group session, following months of intensive psychological work directed at resolving relationships with our parents. I found the therapy (which has since become organized as Fischer-Hoffman therapy in the United States—see Hoffman, 1976) highly revealing and effective, discovering and working through enormous areas of transference and distortion with my parents and achieving a much better, more loving, and far more adult relationship with them. When Bob Hoffman walked in for the final group session, however, I was struck by a tremendous insight: he looked a lot like and acted a lot like my father, and so when I first saw him I had been seized by a very strong transference reaction, projecting the things I disliked about my father and hadn't resolved onto Bob Hoffman!

Of course I had no idea that this was happening at the time and took conscious pride in being a knowledgeable and sophisticated psychologist and psychic researcher who saw instantly what a 'phony psychic' Hoffman was. (And how superior I was!) In point of fact, I had not been perceiving Bob Hoffman at all; I had been deluded by my projections. As a result of the therapy process and the resolutions of many un- and semi-conscious attitudes I held towards my father, I could now separate the actual, immediate reality of Hoffman from my mind's tendency to project. I realized I knew essentially nothing about Bob Hoffman as a real person—he may have numerous faults for all I know—but I was very grateful for the results of the therapeutic and growth process he and Dr Naranjo had worked out.

This anecdote about my transference problems is not intended necessarily to imply anything about Mr Dobinson's psychological make-up, for I know nothing about him personally other than assuming that he, like me, is a product of modern culture. The point is rather that what we want and expect in a psychological or spiritual teacher may not necessarily be what we need or be an accurate way to judge whether someone is a 'genuine' spiritual teacher. Indeed, there is a recognized category of 'crazy wisdom' teacher in many spiritual traditions in which some of the most evolved teachers may deliberately flout conventional morality and expectations and insult their students and their conditioned world-view in order to cut through their students' obstacles more effectively than conventional sweetness-and-light approaches would. I have certainly learned as much or more from those who pushed hard on me as from those who made me feel good about myself. On the other hand, both personally and professionally as a transpersonal psychologist, I am quite uncomfortable with this idea of crazy wisdom teachers, as it can so easily be used by charlatans and deluded pseudo-teachers (and by students) to justify immoral actions. Dobinson's warnings on this are quite appropriate and apply to all spiritual paths. Nevertheless, my own experience given above and that of the wisdom traditions suggests that it is not always too easy to judge the genuineness of a teacher and whether his or her teachings may be useful for us.

Again speaking both personally and as a transpersonal psychologist, I have found many of Gurdjieff's ideas and practices to be very useful. Of course many are in a category that I cannot comprehend (although whether that says the ideas are wrong or my understanding is too limited is often unclear to me), some certainly seem wrong to me, and some I put in the category of remarks Gurdjieff deliberately made to shock students but not intended to be written down (as students tend to do) as 'eternal truths'. But if we want to grow, it is not our job to adopt or reject anyone else's ideas wholesale, but to come to our own best understanding of important truths. I suggest that interested readers get some more direct and accurate acquaintance with Gurdjieff's ideas than Dobinson's article. Two of my own books, *Waking Up* (Tart, 1986) and *Living the Mindful Life* (Tart, 1994) are readable expositions of some of Gurdjieff's psychological and spiritual ideas, phrased in modern psychological terms, and Ouspensky's *In Search of the Miraculous* (Ouspensky, 1949) is the classic reference work that I often refer back to, although Ouspensky's presentation is rather over-intellectualized.

Institute of Transpersonal Psychology
744 San Antonio Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303, U.S.A.

CHARLES T. TART

REFERENCES

- Hoffman, R. (1976) *Getting Divorced from Mother and Dad: The Discoveries of the Fischer-Hoffman Process*. New York: Dutton.
Ouspensky, P. D. (1949) *In Search of the Miraculous*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
Tart, C. (1986) *Waking Up: Overcoming the Obstacles to Human Potential*. Boston: New Science Library.
Tart, C. (1994) *Living the Mindful Life*. Boston: Shambhala.

To the Editor,

With regard to the exchange of letters between M. H. Coleman and the late Gordon Stein on the subject of Home's self-playing accordions and mouth-organs (April 1996 issue), I would like to offer the following contribution.

As many readers will remember, the discussion centred on a story that the late writer William Lindsay Gresham told James Randi about the medium D. D. Home. Gresham was doing research for a book he was going to write on Home and told Randi that he had discovered "a small harmonica among Home's effects held at the Society for Psychical Research in London". Since such a harmonica can be played when put inside one's mouth, without the use of the hands, Gresham suggested that Home could have used it to simulate the sound of the accordion being played by the spirit.

This is how Gardner (1988), Stein (1993) and Randi (1995) had reported the story so far.

However, as M. H. Coleman (1996) has pointed out, the story of finding the mouth-organ seems lacking in "corroborative detail": it is not stated "where or from whom, and in what terms, the story was first received". Remembering

that I had heard this story from Randi before it was published for the first time by Stein, and remembering that I had heard it in more detail than the versions that have so far appeared, I thought it would be interesting to discuss the matter further with Randi.

I asked him if he remembered on what occasion Gresham first told him the story, and how the fact that the harmonica described could not be found among the items in the collection at the SPR could be accounted for.

"I recall that it was immediately following Gresham's trip to England," Randi told me. "He was there researching both Home and Margery Crandon. He was very excited about the discovery, as well as over the discovery of a number of white gloves in the SPR/Home collection. His idea was that Home wore white gloves and as part of his routine used a fake forearm that also wore a glove. As I remember, he told me that he had found more than one of the one-octave mouth-organs, and had discussed the implications with someone at the SPR at the time. Is it possible that these were removed from the collection . . . ? Of course, I only have Gresham's account to go by, but I recall that he was very excited, and was looking into accounts of what tunes had been heard at the séances, to see if they could be played on one octave. Gresham also had many other observations on possible scenarios for Home's tricks. He pointed out that the 'full light' of a Victorian living-room was a few gas-lights, not at all what we would consider 'bright' by modern standards. He also noted that Home was such a celebrity, he must have been able to dictate the conditions, who could attend, and how far away they would sit or stand. His pre-knowledge of the guest list would be very valuable to him, indeed."

I then asked Randi if he could remember the year when Gresham told him about this. "I really don't know. I was living in NYC at the time, and Bill was living in New Rochelle. That would make it about 1960, I believe. But I'm very bad on years."

At this point, it would be interesting to see if somebody who was on the SPR Council around 1960 remembers a visit by Gresham, or if such a visit has been recorded elsewhere. It would also be interesting to know if "a number of white gloves" are still among the items in the SPR/Home collection.

(Randi's statements as reported above have been read and confirmed by Randi himself.)

CICAP
P.O. Box 60
27058 Voghera (PV), ITALY

MASSIMO POLIDORO

REFERENCES

- Coleman, M. H. (1966) Correspondence. *JSPR* 61 (843), 127.
Gardner, M. (1988) *The New Age*, 177. Buffalo: Prometheus Books.
Randi, J. (1995) *The Supernatural A-Z*, 159. London: Headline.
Stein, G. (1993) *The Sorcerer of Kings*, 83. Buffalo: Prometheus Books.

NOTES FOR AUTHORS (revised October 1996)

Content Authors take responsibility for any opinions expressed. Papers are published on the understanding that they have not been published before and are not concurrently under offer to any other journal. They must be written in English.

Authors are reminded that as this journal has an international circulation they should avoid any wording or allusions that might make comprehension difficult for readers whose native language is not English.

Organization of Manuscripts Papers should not normally exceed 5,000 words. Authors are responsible for the preparation of artwork for figures and tables and these and any photographs submitted should be of quality suitable for reproduction.

Authors are advised that there is no substitute for studying a recent issue to see how articles and other contributions are set out, references given and so on.

In addition, manuscripts should be typed (or equivalent) in print of a clearly legible size, double-spaced on one side of the paper only, with wide margins. Please indent the start of each paragraph. Use italics where appropriate if available; otherwise use underlining to indicate italics.

References References should be listed in alphabetical order by author. Periodical titles should be given in full except for the following, which should be abbreviated as shown:—

Journal of the (American) Society for Psychical Research—J(A)SPR
Proceedings of the (American) Society for Psychical Research—Proc(A)SPR
(European) Journal of Parapsychology—(E)JP

Research in Parapsychology—RIP

When quoting from bound volumes of periodicals, please give the exact year rather than the inclusive years for the whole volume.

Footnotes These should be indicated in the text by superscript numerals at the appropriate places, numbering

consecutively. The notes should then be set out as an appendix to the paper under the heading, 'Footnotes'. Alternatively, they may be put at the foot of the text page concerned, separated from the rest of the text by a line. Although references may be cited in footnotes, please do not use footnotes as a way of giving references. **Submission** Authors should submit two copies of their papers to the Editor, Dr John Beloff, 6 Blacket Place, Edinburgh, (United Kingdom) EH9 1RL. E-mail: <john.beloff@ed.ac.uk> Prior correspondence is advised for new authors.

Publication If the paper is accepted the author or first-named of joint authors will be sent photocopies of the typeset pages for checking and correction of any printer's errors (but proofs are not usually sent for letters). On publication four copies of the issue will be sent to the author (or to each of joint authors) of each Article, and one copy likewise for each Note, Book Review, letter, notice, etc. *If you do not need these copies please let the Production Editor know.*

COPYRIGHT

Permissions Authors are responsible for securing written permission to reproduce any published or unpublished material for which copyright is currently held. It is not normally necessary to secure permission to publish short quotations from published works.

Transfer It is hoped that authors will assign the copyright of their work to the Society for Psychical Research.

Copyright Clearance (U.S.A.) This is covered under the U.S. Federal Copyright Act (1976) by the code printed below. Copies of material in the issue may be made for personal or internal use of those clients who are registered with the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (21 Congress Street, Salem, MA 01970, U.S.A.).

© Society for Psychical Research 1997
0037-1475 / 97 \$3.00